

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 852

SP 028 887

AUTHOR Killian, Joyce E.; And Others  
TITLE Cooperating Teachers as Instructional Supervisors:  
The Effects of Their Preparation on the Quality of  
the Student Teaching Experience.  
PUB DATE 24 Apr 87  
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the  
American Educational Research Association  
(Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).  
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -  
Research/Technical (143)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary  
Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher  
Education; Preservice Teacher Education; \*Student  
Teachers; \*Supervisory Training; \*Teacher  
Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This study expands a previous longitudinal study. The field experiences of students placed with trained and untrained cooperating teachers were compared by analyzing records of time spent in various classroom activities, planning, and conferencing. Subjects were 35 elementary and secondary education student teachers participating in a 16-week student teaching semester in a rural school district. Seventeen student teachers were placed with trained cooperating teachers; 18 were with untrained cooperating teachers. The subjects kept daily records of the amount of time they spent on observation, full- and small-group teaching, tutoring, and supervisory duties. Taped interviews at mid- and end-of-semester yielded data about lesson planning and conferences with cooperating teachers. Following a brief description of the training program for cooperating teachers, the major activities of the student teachers and data gathered from interviews are discussed. It is noted that elementary teachers were disproportionately represented in the trained sample and thus created an imbalance in the analysis of the comparative effect of grade level. Support was found for the assertion that training for cooperating teachers helps to prepare them for their role. (JD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED282852

COOPERATING TEACHERS AS INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS:  
THE EFFECTS OF THEIR PREPARATION ON THE QUALITY OF  
THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Joyce E. Killian, D. John McIntyre, & Patricia J. Wheeler  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL 62901

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of  
The American Educational Research Association  
April 24, 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*J. E. Killian*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy

Cooperating Teachers as Instructional Leaders:  
The Effects of their Preparation on the Quality of  
the Student Teaching Experience

INTRODUCTION

Numerous articles have appealed for teacher education programs to include formalized training for cooperating teachers (Copas, 1984; Lipke, 1979; Killian and McIntyre, 1986). While the need for feedback about performance is necessary to promote growth in any profession, research in teacher education has consistently indicated that cooperating teachers avoid direct assessment, especially when it is negative (Lipke, 1979; Lowther, 1968; Mills, 1980). Applegate and Lasley (1984) based their call for supervisory training on the quality of feedback provided by trained cooperating teachers. Their assessment is that untrained cooperating teachers establish expectations or goals for themselves and their field experience students that are either unrealistic or unattainable. In contrast, they note, trained cooperating teachers have a more realistic set of expectations for the students assigned them, a better understanding of the university's expectations, and more confidence in their own ability as supervisors.

Despite such appeals for training, research has seldom addressed its effectiveness in improving the quality of field experiences. Boyan and Copeland (1974) reported an extensive study of the effects of supervisory training on

cooperating teachers and student teachers in a Teacher Corps project. They indicated that the major benefit was that both groups could demonstrate and, to some extent, use the various stages of the instructional supervision process. Trained cooperating teachers may also have higher credibility with their student teachers. Survey data analyzed by Curtis and Morris (1985) indicated that student teachers marked trained cooperating teachers higher on all items of a 68 item performance profile.

To date, most research on the effectiveness of training programs has drawn conclusions based on surveys of student teachers about the quality of their supervision. The exception is the Boyan and Copeland research and, more recently, the longitudinal research of Killian and McIntyre (1986 and 1987) which compared the field experiences of students placed with trained and untrained cooperating teachers by analyzing records of time spent in various classroom activities, as well as in planning and conferencing. They found that student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers, particularly in the early field experiences, had a more varied and active involvement in classroom interactions and received more feedback from their cooperating teachers. The Killian and McIntyre research was hindered in the final student teaching phase by a decline in the number of original subjects who were still available for study. In addition, other findings from their research indicated that the grade level of a student

teacher's placement played a critical role in the nature of the field experience. This grade level factor was not controlled on in their comparison of trained vs. untrained. The current research extends the earlier Killian and McIntyre inquiry by increasing the sample size and by controlling on grade level before comparing data for the trained and untrained groups. In addition, it incorporates data from interviews about the feedback and conferencing that student teachers received in order to assess qualitative differences in the experience for students in both groups.

#### METHODS AND DATA SOURCE

##### Subjects

Subjects were 35 elementary and secondary students who completed a 16 week student teaching semester in a rural school district. Seventeen of the student teachers were placed with trained cooperating teachers; eighteen were with untrained cooperating teachers. Nineteen of the student teachers were placed in K-6 settings; sixteen were placed in grades 7 through 12.

##### The Training Course

Trained cooperating teachers were those who had completed a three credit graduate course in the supervision of field experiences. The teachers were self-selected participants. The course was designed to address the needs

and problems encountered in supervising student teachers and had a variety of objectives. The skills of observation and providing critical feedback were the major focus of the course. Deficiencies in the areas of observing and providing critical feedback have been frequently cited in the literature (Mills, 1980; Copas, 1984; Boyan and Copeland, 1974). For example, Zimpher, De Voss and Nott (1980) reported that cooperating teachers generally do not review student teachers' work critically nor are they interested in observing them. Also, cooperating teachers tend to avoid critical evaluations and negative remarks (Andrews, 1967; Lipke, 1979; Mills, 1980; Tabachnick, Popkewitz and Zeichner, 1979-80; Griffin et al, 1983). In fact, Fink (1976) found that cooperating teachers tend to write positive evaluations of student teachers without observing them.

As a foundation for the communication skills needed in supervising student teachers, cooperating teachers also learned about psychological development, concerns and perceptions which frequently influence student teachers' behaviors over the course of the semester (Thies-Sprinthall, 1984). Knowing the concerns and anxieties which may preoccupy the novice teachers, cooperating teachers should be in a better position to design a gradual induction into teacher responsibilities. Activities to encourage more effective interpersonal communication were based upon this psychological foundation. Cooperating teachers discussed

and practiced techniques designed to help them describe classroom behaviors in behavioral rather than judgmental statements and to free their student teachers to examine teaching problems important to them, to ask for help, to explore alternatives, and to propose and implement strategies for solutions (Boyan and Copeland, 1978).

Participants in the training course also worked on ways to make the induction process sequential and gradual over the course of a three-level field experience and to make the evaluation process an ongoing one rather than a summative one at each level. This focus was based on research examining how cooperating teachers direct student teachers' activities in the classroom. Tabachnick, Popkewitz and Zeichner (1979-80) discovered that student teachers were involved in a narrow range of classroom activities over which they had little control. Their teaching was routine and mechanical, and became equated with moving children through prescribed lessons in a given period of time. Further, student teachers' interactions with cooperating teachers revealed conscious avoidance of both conflict and substantive discussion about the student teacher's performance. Applegate and Lasley (1982) reported that cooperating teachers do not view themselves as responsible for career exploration or socialization, yet both occur during the student teaching experience.

## Measures

Student teachers were asked to keep daily records of the amount of time they spent engaged in a variety of activities. This Clockhour Data form (See Appendix A) included the following: observation of their cooperating teacher; full group teaching; small group teaching; individual tutoring; general supervisory duties, like study halls or recess; planning or preparation; and conferences with their cooperating teachers. For analysis, data from clockhour forms were divided into four quarters so that time use could be described and compared longitudinally. Analysis of covariance was used to control on grade level before making statistical comparisons of the length of time spent each category, each quarter, for student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers vs. those placed with untrained cooperating teachers.

Qualitative data was collected at mid-semester and end-of-semester interviews with a balanced sample of student teachers placed with trained and untrained cooperating teachers. Interviews were tape recorded for later transcription and analysis. Students were asked open-ended questions about the frequency, length and focus of their planning conferences with cooperating teachers. They were also asked questions to probe their sense of autonomy in planning and initiation of conferences. Another set of questions elicited comments about the frequency, length and



focus of evaluative feedback they had received and their yperception of its specificity and validity. A complete list of all of the interview questions is included in Appendix B. Interview transcripts were separated into four groups for analysis: elementary trained, elementary untrained, secondary trained, and secondary untrained.

Answers to several questions were transformed into quantitative data and analyzed for central tendency. These included questions that asked for numbers of times, lengths of time, and percentages. When possible, responses were converted to percentages or scores on a continuum to allow for comparison of means between groups.

## FINDINGS

### The Effects of Grade Level

Because earlier research had produced evidence that grade level placement is a major factor in the nature and quality of the field experience (Killian and McIntyre, 1986), the present research controlled on grade level before assessing differences attributable to the training status of the cooperating teachers. In doing so, a major problem with the cell size of the groups became apparent, as Figure 1 indicates. While samples were well balanced for grade level and for proportions of trained vs. untrained, it was evident that elementary teachers were disproportionately represented in the trained sample. In other words, it would seem that elementary teachers were more likely to have voluntarily participated in the training course.

---

Figure 1

Number of Subjects in Trained and Untrained Groups, by Grade Level

---

	Elementary	Secondary
TRAINED	13	4
UNTRAINED	6	12

---

The impact of this imbalance was apparent in the analyses of covariance which were run on the clockhour data. When grade level was entered as the covariate before training, it consistently accounted for more of the variation than did the training variable. Tables 1 and 2 serve as examples of this cumulative effect of grade level and training. (To avoid repetition, other tables are not included. They are available in the Wheeler dissertation, 1987.) Thus, while significant differences were apparent for the combined effects, it would not be valid with the current sample size and interaction of grade level to claim quantitative differences on the training variable.

This finding that grade level operates as a much more powerful influence than training led the researchers to reassess the way they analyzed the data for other portions of the research. Sample size for secondary trained was only four. In addition, the secondary sample was less homogeneous than the elementary one because of differences in the preparation and teaching assignments by subject area. These problems led us to drop the secondary sample from further analysis in the present research and to focus on the remaining elementary data.

#### Clockhour Data for Major Activities

Clockhour data for elementary subjects were separated for training status of cooperating teachers for further analysis. Because the sample size for untrained subjects was small ( $n=6$ ), statistical comparisons are not reported.

In some respects the daily activities for those student teachers placed with trained and untrained cooperating teachers was quite similar. Observation of the cooperating teacher predominated during the first quarter, but was quickly replaced by full group teaching as the major daily activity during all other quarters. In other respects, however, trends in the clockhour data over the course of the four quarters indicate a different pattern of involvement for trained and untrained subjects.

Table 3 reports time spent on three major daily activities for elementary student teachers. Data for other categories of activities were not included here because of the similar pattern between trained and untrained groups. They are, however, available in the Wheeler dissertation (1987).

In the category of full group teaching, the amount of time is quite similar for trained and untrained groups during the second half of the semester. Both groups spent between two and a half and three hours per day engaged in full group teaching. A difference is apparent, however, during the first half of the semester. Trained cooperating teachers seem to have gotten their student teachers involved more quickly in full group teaching. The largest increase in this activity occurred between quarter 1 and quarter 2, while for student teachers with untrained cooperating teachers, the shift occurred between quarter 2 and quarter 3.

Trends were also different in the category of clerical duties for the two groups. Student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers experienced a gradual increase of the clerical duties they performed, moving from approximately 35 minutes per day during the first quarter to an hour per day during the fourth quarter. For student teachers placed with untrained cooperating teachers, this gradual increase in clerical duties was not apparent. In fact, the amount of time spent on this activity actually decreased slightly during the second half of the semester, declining from approximately 42 minutes per day to half an hour during quarters 3 and 4.

In the category of observing the cooperating teacher, the pattern was similar for the two groups in that the activity declined for both over the course of the semester, but the amount of time in the category declined more dramatically for the untrained group during the second half of the semester. The contrast is most apparent in the final quarter of the semester when student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers were observing almost an hour a day, as compared with half an hour for those placed with untrained cooperating teachers.

### Interview data

Taped interviews of student teachers at midterm and during the final week of student teaching yielded data about lesson planning and conferencing with cooperating teachers. Appendix B contains a complete list of questions that student teachers were asked. Responses to several questions were transformed into quantitative data through the use of continuums and percentages. These included questions that asked for numbers of times, lengths of time, and frequency of occurrence.

Student teachers' answers to the question, "How many times did you get together to talk about lesson planning?" were placed on a continuum ranging from 1 (rarely; less than once a week) to 4 (daily). Table 4 indicates that frequency of planning was similar for trained and untrained groups during the first half of the semester, averaging "three or four times a week" for both groups. By the end of the semester, however, differences were apparent. While frequency declined for both groups, the decline was steeper for the trained group. By the end of the semester, they were planning with their cooperating teachers about once a week, while the student teachers with untrained cooperating teachers were planning closer to twice a week.

Responses to the question, "How often did your cooperating teacher provide feedback about your teaching performance?" were placed on a continuum ranging from 1 (once a week or less) to 4(daily). Table 5 indicates that

mean continuum scores were higher for the trained group during both halves of the semester. For both groups, frequency of feedback declined after the middle of the semester. Student teachers with trained cooperating teachers received feedback on a daily basis for the first half of the semester, then for approximately three times a week thereafter. Student teachers with untrained cooperating teachers received feedback approximately three times a week during the first half of the semester; then the frequency declined to one or two times per week for the remainder of the semester.

During the interviews students were also asked to estimate the percentage of conferences during which their cooperating teachers gave them suggestions for improvement and also the percentage of conferences during which the cooperating teachers provided feedback about things that were going well. Table 6 indicates that a higher percentage of conferences included positive comments than suggestions for improvement for both trained and untrained groups. For both groups, the percentages in the positive comments category increased during the second half of the semester and declined in the suggestions for improvement category. Differences between the trained and untrained groups were apparent in responses given during the final interview. It would appear that trained cooperating teachers were more inclined than their untrained counterparts to give both

positive comments and suggestions for improvement during the latter half of the student teaching semester.

Student teachers were also asked how frequently their cooperating teachers used a variety of feedback formats, including the following: specific objective data from written notes taken during an observed episode of teaching; specific details recalled from an episode of teaching; positive but general comments not based on a specific episode of teaching; and negative but general comments not based on a specific episode of teaching. Student teachers' responses were placed on a continuum ranging from 1 (seldom) to 3 (often). Table 6 presents a summary of their responses. For both trained and untrained groups, frequency of feedback in all but one category declined or remained stable between the midterm and final interviews. In one category, specific details from memory, untrained cooperating teachers apparently gave more feedback during the second half.

In several respects, however, the trained and untrained groups seemed to have some differences in the types and frequency of feedback they provided. In all but one category (specific details from memory during the second half), student teachers with trained cooperating teachers



reported a higher frequency of feedback during both halves of the semester. Differences were particularly evident in the categories of specific data from written notes during the first half and in negative general comments during the second half.

## DISCUSSION

### Clockhour Data for Major Activities

An unintended but major finding of the present study was that failure to consider grade level in comparing trained vs. untrained could well have led to invalid conclusions. Our analyses of covariance, which controlled on grade level before assessing differences by training status consistently pointed to grade level as the predominant influence in the type and frequency of activities in which student teachers engaged. The disproportionate majority of trained elementary cooperating teachers in our sample and the small cell size in the subgroup of "trained secondary" and "untrained elementary" led us to abandon further statistical comparison of the data. These findings clearly support earlier research which found major differences in the quality of field experiences by grade level (Killian and McIntyre, 1986). Such findings emphasize the need for taking grade level into consideration in future design of research on field experience supervision.

When the elementary clockhour data were analyzed for differences in trends between trained and untrained groups,

it appeared that trained cooperating teachers got their student teachers involved quickly in full group teaching and required them to gradually assume the clerical duties resulting from their teaching load, even when the full group teaching was at its peak. Comments that student teachers made during midterm and final interviews helps to flesh out the nature of the differences in the way the trained and untrained cooperating teachers operated. The trained cooperating teachers apparently expected their student teachers to remain with them for whatever teaching or special duties they still retained. Untrained teachers, by contrast, held off until around the midterm to assign major full group teaching responsibilities and seemed to take on the role of clerical assistant for their student teachers as the latter absorbed the major teaching responsibilities. They also were more likely to excuse their student teachers during their own teaching or special duty assignments so that student teachers could work on lesson plans or paperwork. While this latter approach many have been less burdensome for student teachers at the time, it may also have had the effect of sheltering them from the realities of the total responsibilities of teaching.

#### Interview Data

Returning to the interview transcripts from which data were extrapolated also provides insight about the differences in planning and conferencing for elementary

student teachers placed with trained and untrained cooperating teachers.

One finding based on assessment of interview responses about the frequency of planning was that, while the first half reports of planning were similar for both groups, the frequency of planning dropped more drastically for the student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers. According to comments from student teachers at interviews, the decline was the result of their growing competence. A typical comment from both trained and untrained groups at midterm was this one: "Once a subject is going well, we don't talk a whole lot unless something unusual crops up. The difference in frequency reported in final interviews seems to be related to the tightening up of planning conferences among pairs where things were not going well. One of the untrained student teachers who was experiencing difficulties provided this insight, "At first it was more ME because she just said, 'Do your own thing.' Now she ASKS me what I'm doing."

Assessment of feedback frequency from interviews yielded the finding that while frequency declined between the midterm and final interviews for both groups, the trained cooperating teachers provided more feedback during both halves of the semester. Differences in interview comments again provide some insight, particularly during the second half of the semester. As a student teacher with a trained cooperating teacher put it, frequency of feedback

declined but did not stop entirely: "When she got to the point where she was just saying the same thing over, she didn't feed back so much." Student teachers with untrained cooperating teachers, however, reported something closer to abandonment: "She's not in there much." "She thinks at this stage I should do it on my own." Obviously, cooperating teachers who spent little or no time observing their student teachers toward the end of the semester had scant basis for commenting on their performance.

Continuums based on interview data also yielded the findings that trained cooperating teachers were more inclined to give both positive comments and suggestions for improvement during the latter half of the semester. Student teachers placed with untrained cooperating teachers reported suggestions for improvement during only 7% of the feedback sessions they had during the latter half of their student teaching semester. Their comments at the final interview reflect this absence of constructive criticism:

"Suggestions for improvement? None. I'm doing a better job." Comments from student teachers with trained cooperating teachers suggest that both they and their cooperating teachers may have had a better understanding that constructive criticism did not mean that they were doing a bad job. One student summed up why her trained cooperating teacher continued to provide suggestions for improvement even though her overall progress was excellent:

"It (my teaching) doesn't have to be negative before it needs improvement."

Continuums based on interview responses to the types of feedback student teachers experienced also indicate differences in feedback for the trained and untrained groups. In all but one category (specific details from memory during the second half), student teachers with trained cooperating teachers reported a higher frequency of feedback during both halves of the semester. The differences were particularly apparent in the area of feedback based on notes from observation, which was a common type of feedback among the trained pairs during the first half. During the second half, the finding in the category of "negative general comments" parallels the findings for suggestions for improvement discussed earlier. The trained cooperating teachers clearly persisted longer in critiquing the areas of their student teachers' performance which needed improvement. Additional insight about this feedback could result from knowing how beneficial the student teachers considered each of these types of feedback to be, but this hindsight did not guide our planning of interview questions. What we can glean from their comments is that the student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers do not appear to have been threatened by the negative feedback, as some of their comments at the final interview indicate: "It's positive criticism." "She's good

at turning it around to make it constructive." "After all,  
I'm far from perfect."

## SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

While the continuum data and supporting student teacher comments are clearly restricted by sample size and by their generalizability only to the elementary population, they do offer support for the assertion that a preparation course for cooperating teachers helps to prepare them for their role in providing a gradual but realistic induction into teaching and in providing critical feedback along the way. The trained cooperating teachers in our study were superior in several roles, including providing frequent opportunities for planning and feedback, in basing their feedback on written notes from observations, and in sustaining suggestions for improvement over the course of the semester. Student teachers placed with trained elementary cooperating teachers probably had a tougher student teaching semester than did some of their peers with untrained cooperating teachers. They took on full group teaching earlier, handled more of their own paperwork, and were required to observe their cooperating teachers even when their teaching load was at its height. Their cooperating teachers were businesslike from the start, basing comments on notes from what they observed and providing a high percentage of feedback focusing on things that the student teachers could do better. When the trained cooperating teachers left the room for longer periods of time, student teachers had a sense that they had earned their autonomy. Even when the cooperating teachers left the room for sustained periods of

time, however, the suggestions for improvement persisted among the trained pairs until the end of the semester. Comments from student teachers placed with trained cooperating teachers at the end of the semester indicated that while many perceived that their progress was good, they still had a strong sense that they had a way to go.

The untrained may have had a more "positive" experience, if we had asked them about their stress levels and their sense of having "mastered" teaching, and some future research should ask such questions. But even if such attitudinal differences favor the less structured approach to supervision, we need to ask ourselves which will pay off in the long run in preparing novice teachers for a demanding career and for the collaborative feedback and self-critiquing that will be so important in their continued professional growth.



## References

- Andrews, L. O. (1967). A curriculum to produce career teachers for the 1980's. Theory into Practice, 6, (5), 236-245.
- Applegate, J. H. and Lasley, T.J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2), 15-18.
- Applegate, J. H. and Lasley, T. J. (1984). What cooperating teachers expect from preservice field experience students. Teacher Education, 24. 70-82.
- Boyan, N. J. and Copeland, W. D. (1978). Instructional supervision training program. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Boyan, N. J. and Copeland W. D. (1974). A training program for supervisors: Anatomy of an educational development. Journal of Educational Research, 68(3), 100-116.
- Copas, E. M. (1984). Critical requirements for cooperating teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (6), 49-54.
- Curtis, K. F. and Morris, J. E. (1985). A comparison of supervising teachers receiving supervisory preparation with those not receiving preparation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas.
- Fink, C. H. (1976). Social studies student teachers--What do they really learn? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C.
- Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., and Hukill, H. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Killian, J. and McIntyre, D. J. (1986). Quality in the early field experiences: a product of grade level and cooperating teachers' training. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(4), 367-376.
- Lipke, B. S. (1979). Give your (student) teachers a break. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(2), 31-34.
- Lowther, M. A. (1968). Most and least helpful activities of supervisory teachers. Clearing House, 43(1), 40-43.

- McIntyre, D.J. and Killian, J. (1987). The influence of supervisory training for cooperating teachers on pre-service teachers' development during early field experiences. Journal of Educational Research. In press.
- Mills, J. R. (1980). A guide for teaching systematic observation to student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(6), 28-36.
- Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T. S. and Zeichner, K. M. (1979-1980). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange on Educational Policy, 10(4), 12-29.
- Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1984). Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: Theory, research programs, and implications. Journal of Teacher Education, 35,(3), 53-60.
- Wheeler, P. J. Perceptions of feedback by student teachers with trained and untrained cooperating teachers. Unpublished dissertation. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Zimpher, N. L., deVoss, G. G. and Noss, D. L. A closer look at university student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 11-15.

Table 1

Analysis of Covariance for Daily Time Spent on Full Group Teaching,  
Controlling on Grade Level (2nd quarter)

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio	p.
Grade					
Level	1	7.124	7.124	5.088	.031
Training					
Status	1	1.959	1.959	1.399	.246
Explained	2	9.083	4.542	3.244	.052
Residual	32	44.806	1.400		

Table 2

Analysis of Covariance for Daily Time Spent on Small Group Teaching,  
Controlling on Grade Level (2nd quarter)

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio	p.
Grade					
Level	1	1.52	1.52	5.46	.026
Training					
Status	1	.630	.630	2.262	.142
Explained	2	2.149	1.075	3.861	.031
Residual	32	8.907	.278		

Table 3

Time Spent on Major Daily Activities for Elementary Student Teachers, by Cooperating Teachers' Training Status (N=13 for Trained; N=6 for Untrained)

Activity		1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
Full Group	TRAINED	.8	2.2	2.8	2.6
Teaching	UNTRAINED	1.1	1.5	2.5	2.8
Clerical	TRAINED	.6	.7	.9	1.0
Duties	UNTRAINED	.7	.7	.5	.5
Observing	TRAINED	2.5	1.5	1.0	.9
Cooperating Teacher	UNTRAINED	2.4	1.3	.7	.5

\*Time is given in decimal portion of an hour, i.e., .5=one half hour

Table 4

Mean Frequency of Lesson Planning\* for Elementary Student Teachers

Status	Midterm Interview	Final Interview
Trained (n=7)	2.9	1.6
Untrained (n=6)	2.8	2.1

\*The following continuum was used:

1	2	3	4
Rarely, less than once a week	Once or Twice a week	Three or 4X a week	Daily

Table 5

Mean Frequency of Feedback About Performances\* from Cooperating  
Teacher for Elementary Student Teachers

Status	Midterm Interview	Final Interview
Trained (n=7)	3.4	2.4
Untrained (n=6)	2.3	1.6

\*The following continuum was used:

1	2	3	4
Once a week or less	2 or 3 X per week	Daily at first then declined	Daily

Table 6

Percentage of Conferences which Included Positive Comments and Suggestions for Improvement for Elementary Student Teachers

Type of Feedback		Midterm Interview	Final Interview
Positive	TRAINED (n=7)	76%	98%
Comments	UNTRAINED (n=6)	78%	90%
Suggestions	TRAINED (n=7)	32%	20%
for Improvement	UNTRAINED (n=6)	39%	7%

Table 7

Mean Frequency of Various Forms of Feedback\* for Elementary Student Teachers

Form of Feedback		Midterm Interview	Final Interview
Specific Data			
From Written	TRAINED (n=7)	2.0	1.4
Notes	UNTRAINED (n=6)	1.2	1.2
Specific Details	TRAINED (n=7)	2.7	2.3
From Memory	UNTRAINED (n=6)	2.3	2.7
Positive	TRAINED (n=7)	2.9	2.7
General Comments	UNTRAINED (n=6)	2.5	2.2
Negative	TRAINED (n=7)	1.9	1.9
General Comments	UNTRAINED (n=6)	1.7	1.0

\*The following continuum was used:

1	2	3
Seldom	Sometimes	Often

# FIELD EXPERIENCE WEEKLY CLOCK HOUR SCHEDULE

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

Keep as accurate an account as you can of the time you spend each day in the following activities, giving all time in hours to the nearest 1/4 hour.

CIRCLE APPROPRIATE WEEK NUMBER: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

## DIRECT STUDENT CONTACT HOURS

	M	T	W	T	F
Teaching all pupils in class _____					
Teaching a group of pupils in the class _____					
Teaching an individual pupil _____					
Individual assistance to pupil _____					
Supervising students working independently _____					
Other: _____					

## OTHER TEACHING DUTIES

Specify activity and time spent.

(grading papers, lunch/recess duty, clubs, etc.)	M	T	W	T	F
_____					
_____					

## OBSERVATION

	M	T	W	T	F
Observing your supervising teacher _____					
Observing special teachers (music, art, etc.) _____					
Observing another teacher _____					
Other (specify): _____					

## CONFERENCES with supervising teacher

	M	T	W	T	F
For planning instruction _____					
For evaluating my teaching _____					
Other (specify): _____					

## CONFERENCE TOPICS

	M	T	W	T	F
School policy _____					
Classroom procedure _____					
Curriculum _____					
General teaching philosophy _____					
Specific teaching strategies _____					
Discipline/classroom management _____					
Motivation _____					
Other (specify): _____					
_____					
_____					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

#### INTERVIEW WITH SUPERVISOR (see page 1)

1. Think about the number of times you met with your cooperating teacher during the week.  
a. How many times did you get together to discuss your lesson planning?  
b. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
c. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
d. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
e. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
f. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
g. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
h. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
i. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
j. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
k. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
l. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
m. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
n. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
o. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
p. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
q. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
r. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
s. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
t. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
u. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
v. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
w. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
x. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?  
y. How many times did you discuss your lesson planning?  
z. How many times did you discuss the cooperating teacher's lesson planning?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE